



United
States
Department
of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

February
2015



DRAFT

Decision Notice/ Finding of No Significant Impact

Little Deer Project

**Goosenest Ranger District, Klamath National Forest
Siskiyou County, California**

Township 44 North, Range 2 West, Sections 3-10, 16-19;
Township 45 North, Range 2 West, Sections 32 and 33; and
Township 44 North, Range 3 West, Sections 1, 12, 13, and 24, Mt. Diablo
Meridian.

For Information Contact: Jamie Kolesar
Goosenest Ranger District
37805 Highway 97
Macdoel, CA 96098
530-398-5795

<http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/fs-usda-pop.php/?project=45313>

Non-Discrimination Policy

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination against its customers, employees, and applicants for employment on the bases of race, color, national origin, age, disability, sex, gender identity, religion, reprisal, and where applicable, political beliefs, marital status, familial or parental status, sexual orientation, or all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program, or protected genetic information in employment or in any program or activity conducted or funded by the Department. (Not all prohibited bases will apply to all programs and/or employment activities.)

To File an Employment Complaint

If you wish to file an employment complaint, you must contact your agency's EEO Counselor (PDF) within 45 days of the date of the alleged discriminatory act, event, or in the case of a personnel action. Additional information can be found online at www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_file.html.

To File a Program Complaint

If you wish to file a Civil Rights program complaint of discrimination, complete the [USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form](#) (PDF), found online at www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html, or at any USDA office, or call (866) 632-9992 to request the form. You may also write a letter containing all of the information requested in the form. Send your completed complaint form or letter to us by mail at U.S. Department of Agriculture, Director, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, by fax (202) 690-7442 or email at program.intake@usda.gov.

Persons with Disabilities

Individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing or have speech disabilities and you wish to file either an EEO or program complaint please contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339 or (800) 845-6136 (in Spanish).

Persons with disabilities who wish to file a program complaint, please see information above on how to contact us by mail directly or by email. If you require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) please contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

DRAFT

DECISION NOTICE AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

Little Deer Project

**U.S. Forest Service
Pacific Southwest Region
Klamath National Forest
Siskiyou County, California**

The Little Deer Project was developed in response to landscape-level ecosystem restoration needs following the 2014 Little Deer Fire on the Goosenest Ranger District (District) of the Klamath National Forest (Forest). The Little Deer Fire began on July 31, 2014 and was contained on August 11, 2014, burning about 5,500 acres.

The project boundary follows the fire perimeter, excluding sections of private land on the southwestern and northeastern sections of the fire. Of the 4,192 acres of National Forest System land within the project boundary, the project will treat up to 3,425 acres. Treatments in this project will take place only on National Forest System land, not on private property located within the project area.

The project is located eight miles west of Bray and about 12 miles southwest of Macdoel, California, in Siskiyou County (appendix B; figure 1) in Township 44 North, Range 2 West, Sections 3-10, 16-19; Township 45 North, Range 2 West, Sections 32 and 33; Township 44 North, Range 3 West, Sections 1, 12, 13, and 24, Mt. Diablo Meridian. The project is located within the 5th field Butte Creek and Whitney-Sheep Rock watersheds, the 6th field Horsethief Creek and Grass Lake watersheds, and the 7th field Grass Lake South, Grass Lake Northeast, Upper First Creek, Lower First Creek, Penoyar, and Horsethief Creek watersheds. Highway 97 runs adjacent to this project and travels through a small piece inside the project area.

This Decision Notice (DN) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) are based upon analysis documented in the *Little Deer Project Environmental Assessment* (EA). The EA presents the analysis of two action alternatives and a no action alternative.

An announcement of the availability of the EA for public comment was mailed to interested and affected parties on December 4, 2014 and published in the Siskiyou Daily News on December 8, 2014. The final EA is available for public review on the Forest Service website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/fs-usda-pop.php/?project=45313>. The EA is also available for review at the Goosenest Ranger District in Macdoel, CA and at the Klamath National Forest Supervisor's Office in Yreka, CA.

Decision

Based upon my review of the proposed action and alternatives, the analysis in the EA, information contained in the planning record and input from interested parties, it is my decision to implement alternative 2 as described in the final EA. Project design features were incorporated into the selected alternative; for a detailed discussion of associated project design features, see table 2-1 in chapter 2 of the final EA.

My decision authorizes the following activities:

Alternative 2 (the selected alternative) calls for planting conifers on 1,952 acres; planting shrubs and native grasses on up to 1,474 acres; removing dead trees and trees with a 70 percent likelihood of dying on 1,663 acres; designating 135 acres to firewood access; removing hazard trees near landings and along 12 miles of system roads on 200 acres; and preparing sites for planting on 271 acres.

The selected alternative is comprised of three overlapping treatment types; (1) dead tree removal, (2) hazard tree removal, and (3) planting. To implement these treatments, access is required along 12 miles of National Forest system roads and 9 miles of temporary roads within the project area. Figure 2 in appendix B of the EA displays the treatment areas for the selected alternative.

The following changes were made between the draft and final EA to respond to public comments and implementation challenges based on field verification of treatment feasibility:

- Stands 719-80 (excluding sub-stand 719-80-1) and 719-83 will be added as firewood stands. These stands were originally proposed for dead tree removal; however, after field review it was determined that access issues limited the feasibility of harvesting the stands. These designated stands, in addition to the stands already identified in the EA, will not be commercially harvested prior to firewood cutter access; dead trees will be available for firewood following the proposed logging of surrounding dead tree removal stands.
- Standing and downed incense cedar less than 16 inches diameter at breast height will be made available for firewood cutting following commercial harvest in designated portions of stands 718-89, 718-102, 718-105, 718-106, 718-107, 718-108, 718-122, and 718-124. This change is in response to public comments on the draft EA.
- Planting shrubs and/or seeding of native grasses will take place only in areas determined safe for forest workers. Areas with overhead hazards or unsafe accessibility will be avoided during planting.
- Project design features were added or clarified to respond to public comments or adjusted based on interdisciplinary team review. These project design features are displayed in table 2-1 of chapter 2 in the final EA: ARCH-1, ARCH-5, HYDR-2, HYDR-3 through HYDR-10, NNIS-2, REC/SCEN-4, WL-1, and WL-3.
- Fire and fuels discussions were clarified to emphasize increasing the likelihood of future wildfires being controlled rapidly and safely, and reducing their resistance to control.

Rationale

The selected alternative best meets the purpose and need of the Little Deer Project (see chapter 1 of the EA). The selected alternative allows for:

1. The most likelihood of promoting the successful protection of the public, forest workers, and other resources within the project area. The greatest acreage of dead and dying trees will be removed under the selected alternative.
2. The most utilization of forest products, including firewood, and harvested timber while marketable. The selected alternative allows for public collection of firewood and the greatest volume of sawlogs.

3. The greatest likelihood of restoring the project area to a healthy forested landscape with a diversity of habitat conditions that reflect historical vegetation conditions and the ecological capability of the landscape, including natural openings and native browse species components. The selected alternative will allow for planting conifers, native scrubs and grasses on more acres than the other alternatives. This will result in the most habitat diversity.
4. Restoration of scenery conditions within the project area to a conifer-dominant scenic character that is consistent with historic scenery, while minimizing short-term scenery disturbances. The largest amount of restoration will take place under the selected alternative.

Alternative 1 was not selected for the following reasons:

1. Reduction of safety hazards, limiting fuel continuity, and reduction of large fuel loads to minimize unacceptable future fire risk will be unlikely in this alternative due to the post-fire conditions. Large fuel loads will be in excess of natural or historic fuel loads for this vegetation type. Promoting the successful protection of the public, forest workers, and other resources within the project area will not be likely under these conditions.
2. No forest products, including firewood and timber, will be harvested. Marketable products will remain unused.
3. It is uncertain that the goal of a healthy forested landscape with a diversity of habitat conditions reflective of historical vegetation conditions will be met by the natural recovery on the entire project area with this alternative.
4. The long-term scenic character will continue to be impaired due to the lack of a conifer-dominated canopy on the landscape. Although no direct disturbance will impact short-term scenic integrity, indirect long-term disturbance from the lack of treatment will result in vegetative instability due to the increased likelihood of future fires and tree mortality from insects and disease.

Alternative 3 was not selected for the following reasons:

1. Reduction of safety hazards, limiting fuel continuity, and reduction of large fuel loads to minimize unacceptable future fire risk will occur on fewer acres than in the selected alternative.
2. Less firewood and timber will be harvested than in the selected alternative.
3. The goal of a healthy forested landscape with a diversity of habitat conditions reflective of historical vegetation conditions will not be met on as many acres as in the selected alternative since shrub planting and/or native grass seeding will be limited to dead tree removal units.
4. Restoration of scenery conditions to a conifer-dominant scenic character will not occur on as many acres as in the selected alternative.

Overall Conclusion

I believe that the EA appropriately adopts all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm. Concerns mentioned by the interdisciplinary team and by the public during public scoping and comments on the draft EA are addressed and abated through project design features and alternative development, as discussed in chapters 1 and 2 of the final EA. The project design features listed in table 2-1 in chapter 2 of the EA minimize or eliminate negative

resource impacts. The selected alternative complies with all applicable laws and regulations, and is consistent with the Forest Plan.

I believe the EA presents an objective and well-documented analysis of the environmental effects expected to result from implementation of the selected alternative. The analysis shows that the scenario depicted by the selected alternative can effectively restore the project area, while resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). My conclusion is based on a review of the record that shows a review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk.

Public Involvement

A variety of efforts were made to involve the public in the Little Deer Project analysis. In October 2014, the project was listed in the Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA). On September 22, 2014 a scoping letter was sent to interested and affected parties, including other public agencies, tribes, adjacent property owners, and interested groups and individuals, inviting them to participate in the development of the EA. On September 22, 2014 a legal notice of scoping was published in the Siskiyou Daily News, beginning the formal scoping period and inviting comment on the project.

No official comments were recorded at the BAER public meetings; however, all other comments received as a result of the invitation to participate and the field trips are summarized in appendix D of the EA. I reviewed the comments, identified relevant issues based on the comments, and approved preliminary alternatives to be analyzed in the EA on November 4, 2014.

Once analysis was completed, a distribution letter announcing the EA availability for public review and comment was mailed to interested and affected parties on December 4, 2014; a hardcopy of the EA was provided upon request. Additionally, a legal notice for the EA availability for public review and comment was published in the Siskiyou Daily News on December 8, 2014. Comments were requested within 30 days from publication of the legal notice. The EA and supporting documents were posted to the Forest website for public review. A news release and posting in the Siskiyou Daily News notified the public of a “open house” to be held on the Goosenest Ranger District office on December 11, 2014, to which there were three attendees. Oral comments received during the open house were transcribed and signed by commenters. Thirty-five comment letters and emails were received in response to the EA. All comments received during the 30-day comment period were reviewed and considered for this Decision. See the appendix G of the EA for a listing of comments and responses.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering the effects of the actions analyzed, in terms of context and intensity, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508) for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act includes a definition of “significance.” The elements of this definition are important for a finding of no significant impact, when an action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. The

elements of significance are discussed below in relation to the selected alternative. Resource reports and supporting documents needed for the environmental analysis and compliance with law, regulation, or policy are posted on the project website and located in the project file at the Goosenest Ranger District Office. Conclusions from these reports are discussed and referenced below. These reports are incorporated by reference in the EA.

The significance of environmental impacts must be considered in terms of context and intensity. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts, such as society as a whole (human and national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the selected alternative. In the case of a site-specific action, significance usually depends upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Intensity refers to the severity or degree of impact (40 CFR 1508.27).

Context

The context for this project is limited to about 3,425 of the 4,190 acres of National Forest System land burned in the Little Deer Fire in July-August 2014. The project is located within the 5th field Butte Creek and Whitney-Sheep Rock watersheds, the 6th field Horsethief Creek and Grass Lake watersheds, and the 7th field Grass Lake South, Grass Lake Northeast, Upper First Creek, Lower First Creek, Penoyar, and Horsethief Creek watersheds.

The selected alternative will not pose significant short- or long-term adverse effects, as described in each resource section in chapter 3 of the EA. Project design features, as listed in chapter 2, table 2-1, minimize or avoid adverse impacts to the extent that any impacts are within generally accepted levels. Proposed activities are consistent with standards and guidelines in the Forest Plan.

Intensity

The following were considered in evaluating intensity, or severity of impact:

(1) Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if, on balance, effects are believed to be beneficial.

The selected alternative poses both beneficial (primarily achievement of purpose and need) and adverse effects. Both beneficial and adverse effects were taken into consideration. The selected alternative will benefit the treatment area by removing dead trees, preparing the area for planting, and reducing fuel loads, especially of material 3 inches to 10 inches in diameter. Reforestation will help restore the burned area to a healthy conifer-dominated landscape. Planting of browse species and/or seeding of native grasses will increase cover and forage for wildlife species. Hand piling and burning will reduce fuel loads. Subsequently, future wildfire behavior will be expected to be reduced in resistance to control. The proposed silviculture and fuels treatments are consistent with the Forest Plan.

Beneficial and adverse effects summarized in the EA are fully addressed in resource reports (see project website or project file). Adverse effects will not be significant and are discussed below. Beneficial effects have not been used to offset or compensate for adverse effects in making the finding of “no significant impacts.”

(2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

The proposed activities are governed by standard public health and safety guidelines, Forest Service direction, and other applicable laws and guidelines. Features designed to protect public

health and safety will be included in project implementation contracts. Actions such as dust abatement; road signing, trail and campground closures for public safety; and road maintenance activities will be implemented. Best management practices for the protection of water quality will also be implemented (see appendix E of the EA). Public health and safety are considered in the design of the project.

The selected alternative will reduce the potential fire hazard and subsequently increase firefighter, forest worker, and public safety in the event of a future wildland fire. Reducing large fuel loads will allow firefighters to take appropriate action while allowing fire to resume its natural role in the ecosystem.

For contractor, forest worker and public safety near landings and along system roads, hazard trees will be felled in accordance with the Forest Plan, Forest Service Region 5 hazard tree guidance (FSH 7709.59 Chapter 40), Federal Highway Safety Act, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Forest workers will avoid planting or seeding in areas where overhead hazards exist. Planting shrubs and/or seeding of native grasses will be limited to areas that are in natural openings and along rocky outcroppings without snags. Larger trees or trees leaning away from the road that are unlikely to fall into the road during operations will not be felled. Roadside hazard trees felled within tree removal stands will be removed from site. Any hazard trees felled outside these dead tree removal stands will be left on site.

(3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas.

Historic and/or cultural resources located within the project area boundary will be avoided or protected (see the *Archaeological Resources Report* in the project file, and project design features ARCH-1 to ARCH-5 found in table 2-1 of chapter 2 in the EA).

There are no other unique physical geographical features located within the project area, such as parklands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. Therefore, there will be no effects to such resources from the proposed project.

The burned area is visible for a five-mile stretch along, and views into the burned area may reach 500-600 feet from, the Volcanic Legacy National Scenic Byway (Highway 97) and visible about one mile along Forest road 70 which forms a portion of the northern boundary of the project area. The selected alternative will help restore the historic conifer-dominant scenic character of the area while minimizing unavoidable short-term scenery disturbances through retention of natural-appearing groups of trees.

(4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

Legitimate controversy must be based on credible scientific evidence. Public involvement efforts (refer to chapter 1 of the EA, Public Involvement section) revealed two relevant issues regarding the environmental effects of the proposed action, as listed in chapter 1, Issues section table 1-3. The Forest Service responded to public comments on the EA (appendix G of the EA). Other issues are addressed in the EA and in supporting documents including resource reports.

Post-fire logging, hand-piling and burning activity fuels, and conifer reforestation are standard practices on the Klamath National Forest. A certain amount of controversy over post-fire logging exists, as reflected in some comments and scientific literature provided by individuals and groups

during the scoping period. The topic of “scientific controversy” for each relevant resource is addressed in chapter 3 of the EA and supporting resource reports; in the disposition of scoping comments (see appendix D of the EA); in response to comments on the EA (appendix G of the EA); and through project-specific design features (table 2-1 of chapter 2 of the EA).

Opposing viewpoints do not necessarily mean scientific controversy. What constitutes available relevant science may vary over time and across scientific disciplines. The Forest Service shows consideration of the available relevant science when ensuring the scientific integrity of the discussions and analyses in the project NEPA document. Specifically, the NEPA document identifies methods used, references scientific sources relied upon, discusses responsible opposing views, and discloses incomplete or unavailable information (40 CFR, 1502.9 (b), 1502.22, 1502.24). The project record, including the EA, resource reports and other supporting documentation, and copies of literature cited documents the scientific information considered. Scientific information considered includes, but is not limited to, papers, reports, literature reviews, review citations, peer reviews, science consistency reviews, opposing views, and results of ground-based observations which were considered to ensure the use of available relevant science for this project and analysis.

(5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The selected alternative was designed to achieve objectives identified in the Forest Plan. The analysis shows the effects of the selected alternative are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risk. Project design features and resource protection measures will minimize adverse resource effects. The proposed treatments do not present uncertain effects or unknown risks. This conclusion is based on the consideration of results from many other similar reforestation, fuels reduction, and forest health projects; Forest Service past experience; and expected environmental consequences based on available relevant science. These effects are well-known and documented through similar projects within similar habitats in the local area.

(6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

This project does not set a precedent for any future action. Any planning for future projects will consider all relevant scientific, site-specific information available at that time, and an independent environmental analysis of environmental consequences will be conducted.

(7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.

The cumulative effects of the project in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the area (e.g. harvesting on private land, First Creek Forest Health Management Project, Erickson Vegetation, Fuels, and Road Management Project, Pomeroy Project fires, grazing etc.) are analyzed and found to be relatively minor for all resources. A list of actions considered for cumulative effects can be found in appendix C of the EA.

Resource sections in chapter 3 display the cumulative effects of past, present and reasonable foreseeable future actions added to the effects of each alternative for treatment of the Little Deer Project area. There are no cumulatively significant effects on any resource.

(8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

Cultural resources (archaeological and historic sites) identified during literature reviews, inventories and/or surveys are examined to determine if there are potential effects to them associated with implementation of this project. Approximately 68 percent of the Little Deer project area, or 3,263 acres, have been surveyed for the presence of historic properties and the findings from the completed surveys are documented in 11 survey reports. Approximately 32 percent of the Little Deer project area was not examined because the probability of finding cultural resources in the steep lava flows emanating from southwest flank of Little Deer Mountain is determined to be very low. A total of 15 recorded archaeological sites are located within the Little Deer project area. These sites consist of seven historic railroad logging camps or associated trash deposits; one depression era trash deposit; two post-WWII trash deposits; three trash deposits with cans dating from 1908 through the 1950s; one prehistoric obsidian scatter; and one obsidian workshop area. None of these sites have been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) so all will be protect as though they are eligible. In compliance with the *Region 5 Programmatic Agreement for Compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA* (Provision III. D. (2)), relevant archaeological sites have been identified and will be protected by applying standard resource protection measures in or adjacent to the area of potential effect (see chapter 2, table 2-1 of the EA) (Paullin 2014).

(9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an Endangered or Threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Under the Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, federal agencies are required to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or adversely modify a species' critical habitat. In compliance with requirements of the act, the Forest Service has evaluated the project's possible effects on federally-listed species. For more information, see chapter 3 of the EA and the *Wildlife Resource Report*; both are on the project website and available at the district office.

Compliance with the Endangered Species Act is not pertinent to this project since there are no known occurrences and no suitable habitat for federally-listed species in the project or analysis area. Compliance with the 2001 Record of Decision (as amended) concerning survey and manage species is also not pertinent as there are no known occurrences and no suitable habitat for survey and manage species (see chapter 3 of the EA and the *Wildlife Resource Report*).

The Little Deer Project is not within the range of any federally listed threatened, endangered or proposed plant species. A field review has been conducted, and no potentially suitable habitat has been located. The selected alternative will therefore have no effects on federally-listed threatened, endangered, or proposed plant species (chapter 3 of the EA and the *Botany Resource Report*).

(10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The selected alternative is consistent with Federal, State, and local law or requirements essential for the protection of the environment. It is consistent with the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan), the National Fire Plan, National Forest Management Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and other applicable laws and regulations.

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

The selected alternative responds to the forest-wide and management area standards and guidelines in the Forest Plan in compliance with the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (chapter 2 of the EA). More information on compliance with the Forest Plan is found in the Forest Plan consistency checklist on the project website. The selected alternative is in compliance with other acts and executive orders as follows:

Endangered Species Act

The project will not affect viability of listed species because the project is outside the range of species or there is no habitat for the species in the project area. See Intensity Factor #9 for a discussion of effects on other threatened or endangered species. Additional information is available in the *Wildlife Resource Report* and chapter 3 of the EA.

Clean Water Act

The project complies with the Waiver conditions, which means that it complies with the Basin Plan, The Porter Cologne Act, the Total Maximum Daily Load and the Clean Water Act. The project also complies with the Forest Plan standards and guidelines related to water quality (see Forest Plan consistency checklist). Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been certified by the State Water Quality Resources Control Board and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a way to protect water quality from impacts stemming from non-point sources of pollution. These practices have been applied to forest activities and have been found to be effective in protecting water quality within the Forest. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (North Coast Region) was consulted regarding this project (chapter 4 of the EA). No concerns were expressed by the Water Board regarding the project.

National Historic Preservation Act

This project is in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as described in Intensity Factors #3 and #8 (see the Cultural Resources section of Chapter 3 of the EA). Consultation with federally-recognized tribes was initiated in accordance with the Region 5 Programmatic Agreement, the *National Historic Preservation Act*, and other laws and regulations. No concerns were expressed regarding the project. Implementation of project design features will protect any cultural resources. The selected alternative will not result in any negative impacts to cultural resource sites. This project is in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Clean Air Act and Other Air Quality Laws

All alternatives are compliant with the Clean Air Act and the Conformity Rule. The project will not prevent the progress of the State of California's Regional Haze Plan as required by the Regional Haze Rule, and will be consistent with the Forest Plan as displayed on the Forest Plan consistency checklist, available on the project website.

Executive Order 13112—Noxious Weeds

The project is in compliance with Presidential Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species, 64 Federal Register 6183 (February 8, 1999). This order addresses prevention and control of the introduction and spread of invasive species. Known occurrences and/or potential habitat for noxious weed species are considered. With the weed prevention design criteria in place, the Little

Deer Project has a low risk of weed introduction and spread (chapter 3 of the EA and the *Botany Resource Report*).

Executive Order 12898—Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 relating to Environmental Justice requires an assessment of whether minorities or low-income populations will be disproportionately affected by any proposed action. Although there are a high proportion of lower income people living in the vicinity of the project area as compared to other areas of California, as well as a number of tribal groups of Native Americans, the selected alternative will have no adverse effects on human health or the environment that are significant, unacceptable, or above generally accepted norms and; therefore, there will be no disproportionate effects on minorities or low income population (chapter 3 of the EA and the *Social and Economics Resource Report*).

Administrative Review or Objection Opportunities

This draft decision is subject to objection pursuant to 36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B. Objections will only be accepted from those who submitted project-specific written comments during scoping or other designated comment periods. Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information arising after the designated comment period.

Objections must be submitted within 45 days following the publication of this legal notice in the *Siskiyou Daily News*. The date of the legal notice is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to object should not rely upon dates or timeframes provided by any other source. It is the objector's responsibility to ensure evidence of timely receipt (36 CFR 218.9).

Objections may be submitted via mail, FAX (707-562-9229) or delivered during business hours (M-F 8:00am to 4:00pm). Objections must be submitted to the reviewing officer: Randy Moore, Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service; Attn: *Little Deer Project*; 1323 Club Drive, Vallejo, CA 94592. Ph. (707) 562-8737. Electronic objections, in common formats (.doc, .pdf, .rtf, .txt) formats, may be submitted to: objections-pacificsouthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us.

Objections must include (36 CFR 218.8(d)): 1) name, address, and telephone; 2) signature or other verification of authorship; 3) identify a single lead objector when applicable; 4) project name, Responsible Official name and title, and name of affected Ranger District(s); 5) reasons for, and suggested remedies to resolve, your objections; and 6) description of the connection between your objections and your prior comments. Incorporate documents by reference only as provided for at 36 CFR 218.8(b).

Implementation Date

Following objection proceedings under 36 CFR 218, implementation of the decision may begin immediately following the publication date of the legal notice of this decision in the *Siskiyou Daily News*, the newspaper of record. There will be no further review of this response by any other Forest Service or U.S. Department of Agriculture official as per 36 CFR 218.11(b)(2).

Contact Person

For additional information about how to object, contact Wendy Coats at wcoats@fs.fed.us or 530-841-4470. For additional information about the project or decision contact please contact Jamie Kolesar, 530-398-5730; or jkolesar@fs.fed.us.

Signature and Date

PATRICIA A. GRANTHAM
Forest Supervisor

DATE